

Agenda Item No. 11(B)3

TO:

DATE:

December 16, 2003

Honorable Chairperson Barbara Carey-Shuler, Ed.D. And Members, Board of County Commissioners

FROM:

George M. Burgess

County Mana

SUBJECT:

Semi-Annual Report

Value Analysis/Engineering Studies January 1, 2003 to June 30, 2003

In accordance with Administrative Order 3-26, as amended, the attached report provides a summary of value analysis/engineering studies conducted on County construction projects within established guidelines. Departments reported fifteen (15) projects, which met the criteria for formal value analysis for the period of January 1, 2003 to June 30, 2003.

Nine (9) projects with a total project budget of \$375,031,000 are completed or are in progress. The recommended value analysis/engineering savings for nine (9) projects totaled \$26,450,145. Departments reviewed and approved \$16,210,392 (61% of recommendations) as consistent with operational needs and projected requirements. Reported amounts translate to 4.32% savings on initial project budgets. This percent savings on the initial project budget may increase when the Performing Arts Center (PAC) and the Miami-Dade Housing Agency (Hope VI Rehabilitation Program) complete the value analysis/engineering recommendations.

The value analysis/engineering studies for the remaining six (6) projects have yet to be completed. The next report will cover the period beginning July 1, 2003 through December 31, 2003 and will be submitted for your review by February 2004.

Attachment

Pedro G. Hernandez, P.E.

Assistant County Manager

ITEM NO. Department Contact: Jose Perez Department: General Service Administration **=** 4 ដ 22 ö NW Building Remodeling - Project 9703 Construction of a 7,500 square foot Library - Project W30114 Construction of a 15,000 square foot Library - Project W20202 W20259 South Dade Government Courthouse Renovation - Project W20046 TGK Negative Air Upgrade - Project W00593 ITD Bunker Retrofit - Project W20150 MDPD Station #9 - Project 9607 PROJECT DESCRIPTION Construction of a 7,500 square foot Library - Project W20002 Construction of CAA OpaLocka Head Start Facility - Project W00817 Construction of CAA West Regional Head Start Facility - Project W00770 Construction of CAA NE Regional Head Start Facility - Project W00769 Courthouse Center 28th and 29th Floor Renovations Project W20059 Women's Detention Center HVAC Updgrade - Project W00872 Courthouse Center 24th and 30th Floor Renovations - Project W20060 & 8 PROJECT BUDGET (\$) \$3,430,566 \$3,430,566 \$1,860,000 \$1,512,500 \$2,449,938 \$3,850,000 \$2,534,893 \$1,797,338 \$2,462,000 \$1,982,935 \$1,718,594 \$2,375,000 \$3,442,219 \$6,372,160 VALUE ANALYSIS / ENGINEERING (VA/E) - JANUARY thru JUNE 2003 Library Taxing District Funds Library Taxing District Funds Library Taxing District Funds Hotel & Beverage Tax FUNDING SOURCE CORF/Justice Adm. CORF/Justice Adm. Federal Grant CORF CORF CORF 얺돢 CORF CORF SORF No. Design being performed in-house No. Design being performed in-house No. Design being performed in-house No. Design in program and schematic phase No. Project under construction No. Design in program and schematic phase No. Design in program and schematic phase AOC requirements No. Construction documents being prepared. Design based on specific AOC requirements No. Construction documents being prepared. Design based on specific No. Construction documents being prepared. Design based on specific Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) requirements No. Project under construction No. Project under construction Project is in closeout If not all recommended savings were approved explain why and strach documentaion as needed. Please indicate the name of the Construction on hold. Project initiated prior to implementation of Administrative Order consultant performing the formal VA/E studies VA/E COMPLETED? (Yes/No) If not, Why? SAVINGS RECOMMENDED FROM VA/E STUDY(S) Telephone (305) 375-1101 Fax: (305) 375-2115 \$ AMOUNT APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT S AMOUNT REJECTED % OF RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED AMOUNT APPROVED AS % OF PROJECT BUDGET Report Date: July 25, 2003 AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTED (\$) AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS NOT IMPLEMENTED (S)

2

IF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED, EXPLAIN

TOTAL

\$39,218,709

TOTAL



Department: Miami-Dade Housing Agency Housing, Planning and Development.

Department Contact: Jose Rodriguez / Robert Levis

Telephone: (305) 644-5244 / (305) 639-5757

Report Date: July 18, 2003

PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING (8) SOURCE Found is recommended swiftings were approved supplain why and affacts documentation as needed. Please indicate the name of the affacts consultant performing the formal VAE studies. Approx. \$70 MM in Consulting, Inc. in conjunction with EAC Consulting, Inc. A copy of Starks Fund and other Sources. In VAE has been completed. It was performed by the Consulting Inc. A copy of Starks Fund and other friend report is attached. Not all recommendations will be incorporated. Please refer to attached letter from H.J. Russell & Company Dated May 5, 2003, which dealts what recommendations will be incorporated and the rationale behind the decisions. \$1,288,802 CFP NO S1,764,588 CFP NO CFP NO TOTAL SECRETARY AMERICAN SECRETARY S2,524,570		\vdash	#c,024,0.			L			
PROJECT BESCRIPTION PROJECT BUDGET SURVEY PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING (8) PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING (9) PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING STATE FUNDING STATE FUNDING STATE FUNDING STATE FUNDING STATE FUNDING STATE FUNDING Construction and Constru		70 \$2.503.430	\$2.524.570	\$5,028,000	TOTAL		\$72.298.802	TOTAL	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT BUDGET (S) PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING If not all recommended savings were appropried spapian why and street commended savings were appropried by an experience of the street of the following perion of consultary perion of savings were appropried by an experience of the street of the following perion of consultary perion									
PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT BUDGET PUNDING PROJECT DESCRIPTION (is) PROJECT BUDGET PUNDING PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING If not all recommended swrings were approved explain why and stack-decommendate are proved explain why and stack-decommendations are needed. Phases indicated by the Consulting firm of Consulting from the Solid Consulting and Other Sources In-Kind Rehabilitation for Apartments and Warehouse ROBERT KING HIGH- Wellness Center \$1,298,902 CFP NO **AE COMPLETEDY (ves/No) if not, Whity? **Index if recommended swrings were approved explain why and stack-decommendations are needed. Phases indicated by the Consulting firm of Consulting from the Apartment of Solid Costs in Kind Contributions and other sources refer to attached eiter from I.J. Anssel & Company Clased May 5, 2003, which details what recommendations will be incorporated and the rationale behind the decisions. **APATEM SOURCE** **APATEM SOURCE									
PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT BUDGET PROJECT BUDGET PROJECT BUDGET PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING (\$) SOURCE SOURCE Construction and Solwin in Supportive Sorvives, In-Kind, Conver Homes FLA 5-020 Controllutions and other Sol Costs Rehabilitation for Apartments and Warehouse Sizes, Bridge Sources, Fund and Other Sources Company Dates May 5, 2003, which details what recommendations will be incorporated and the rationale behind the decisione. Sizes Fund and Other Sources Company Dates May 5, 2003, which details what recommendations will be incorporated and the rationale behind the decisione. Sizes Fund and Sources Company Dates May 5, 2003, which details what recommendations will be incorporated and the rationale behind the decisione. Sizes Fund and Sources Company Dates May 5, 2003, which details what recommendations will be incorporated and the rationale behind the decisione. Sizes Sources Sizes									
PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT BUDGET PROJECT DESCRIPTION (5) PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING (5) PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING (5) PROJECT DESCRIPTION (5) PROJECT DESCRIPTION (6) PROJECT DESCRIPTION (7) PROJECT DESCR									
PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT BUDGET PROJECT BUDGET PROJECT BUDGET PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING (\$) PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING Find procommended swrings were approved applain why and attach documentalon as needed. Please indicate the name of the consulting fine. A copy of season in the function and consulting fine. In conjunction with EAC Consulting fine. A copy of incompany Dated May 6, 2003, which details what recommendations will be incorporated. Please refer to attached letter from H.J. Russell & Company Dated May 6, 2003, which details what recommendations will be incorporated and the rationale behind the decisions. PROBERT KING HIGH - Wellness Canter \$1,000,000 CFP NO NO NO NO NO NAME COMPLETED? (YearNo) Incl. Willy? FUNDING #fnot all recommended swrings were approved applain why and attached. Willy? APACHET ARCHIVET ACCOUNTS ACONS ACONSUMING fine. In conjunction with EAC Consulting fine. A copy of incorporated. Please refer to attached what recommendations will be incorporated and the rationale behind the decisions. **SOURCE** **COMPANY Dated May 5, 2003, which details what recommendations will be incorporated and the rationale behind the decisions. **SOURCE** **SOURCE** **APACHET** **APACHET**									
PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT BUDGET PROJECT BUDGET PROJECT BUDGET PROJECT BUDGET PROJECT BUDGET PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING (\$) PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING					NO	CFP	\$1,764,588	JOE MORETTI - Windows Replacement and HVA0 Installation	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING (\$) PROJECT DESCRIPTION (\$) PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING FIN call recommended swrings were approved applain why and attach documentation as needed. Pleass indicate the name of the consulting Film of Constitution and Satisfied and the incorporated. It was performed by the Consulting Film of ART			_		NO	CFP	\$1,000,000	ROBERT KING HIGH - Wellness Center	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING (\$) PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING Find all recommended swritings were approved applain why and attach documentation as needed. Please indicate the name of the consultant performing the formal VA/E studies Approx. \$70 MM in Construction and Social Hope II Grant Construction and Consulting, Inc. in conjunction with EAC Consulting, Inc. A copy of their final report is attached. Not all recommendations will be incorporated. Please refer to attached letter from H.J. Russell & Company Dated May 5, 2003, which details what recommendations will be incorporated and the rationale behind the decisions.					NO	CFP	\$1,298,802	NEWBERG, 40 Year Re-Certification & Rehabilitation for Apartments and Warehouse	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT BUDGET FUNDING PROJECT ID (5) SOURCE Consultant performing the formal VAIE studies A mount at measure of the consultant performing the formal VAIE studies A mount at measure of the consultant performing the formal VAIE studies A mount at measure of the consultant performing the formal VAIE studies A mount at measure of the consultant performing the formal VAIE studies A mount at measure of the consultant performing the formal VAIE studies A mount at measure of the consultant performing the formal VAIE studies A mount at measure of the consultant performing the formal VAIE studies A mount at measure of the consultant performing the formal VAIE studies A mount at measure of the consultant performance of the c	50.21%		\$2,524,5	\$5,028,000	L		Approx. \$70 MM in Construction and \$36MM in Supportive Services, In-Kind Contributions and other Soft Costs	HOPE VI - Rehabilitation Program Scott Homes FLA 5-004 Carver Homes FLA 5-020	<u> </u>
		\$ AMOUNT REJECTED.		SAVINGS RECOMMENDED FROM VA/E STUDY(\$)	VAE COMPLETED? (Yes/No) if not, Why? If not all recommended savings were approved applain why and effect documentation as needed. Please indicate the name of the consolitant performing the formal VAE studies.		PROJECT BUDGE!	PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT ID	TEM NO.



PROGRAM MANAGEMENT & CONSTRUCTION DIVISION

5 May 2003

Mr. Rick Herrera, P.E. Director, MDHA Dept. of Housing Planning and Development 3000 NW 32nd Street Miami, FL. 33142

Re: Value Engineering Recommendations

Dear Mr. Herrera,

RECEIVED

MAY 0 6 2003

MIAMI-DADE HOUSING APENCY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

A meeting was conducted on Tuesday, April 1, 2003 to discuss our official response to the Value Engineering report. The program management team participating in this meeting was H.J. Russell & Co., The Architects Hall and the Miami-Dade Housing Agency.

As stated in Mr. Hall's memorandum of March 12, 2003, all items listed in the report as potential savings are legitimate. When individually viewed in the context of the entire community and their impact on such a large scale development, all changes must become a catalyst in the areas of business development, job creation, community pride, and increased property values, etc. All quality of life issues become of paramount importance. Therefore, it is our recommendation that some not be adopted as explained below.

I. Total elimination of Sector I frontage road

It is estimated that a savings of \$538,000 could be achieved through the elimination of this road. However, it was not indicated that by eliminating this frontage road, two(2) additional interior roads, each 300 feet in length, at a cost of \$201,000, would be added back into the project cost, along with additional landscaping and fencing along the 22nd Avenue corridor.

The site plan was adjusted by relocating a total of 8 houses from Sectors III and IV in order to better utilize Parcel J in Sector I and providing a more suitable location of these homes, which were previously located in proximity to the railroad tracks bisecting the property. These 8 houses were repositioned from Sectors III and IV, closest to the railroad tracks, to Sector I, far distant from the railroad tracks

It is the team's considered opinion that the creation of this frontage road provides potential homebuyers with a superior quality of life, additional

2267 N.W. 72nd Street • Miami, Florida 33147 (305) 693-5006 • Fax (305) 693-9285 safety for their families and continued accessibility to NW 22nd Avenue.

II. Curved road in Sector II

It has been decided by the program management review team to eliminate the existing curvature of the roadway and replace it with a more symmetrical, "squared off" roadway that directly feeds into the planned sector roadway system.

>The aesthetic appeal of this roadway will not be compromised by replacing a curved road with a more symmetrical roadway pattern.
>It was further decided to "square off" its intersection with NW 72nd Street and NW 22nd Avenue to achieve construction cost savings (see Attachment) and create a more efficient traffic flow pattern.

>The vacant parcel in Sector II also achieves greater symmetry as a result of these changes. The front yards of the surrounding homes face the vacant land parcel, thereby creating "defensible space".

III. Roofing System

The program management review team has decided that further investigation is required into the advantages and disadvantages of a barrel tile roof vs. a conventional shingle roofing system. Any potential cost savings cannot be justified if it will compromise the longevity, quality, and overall appearance of the community.

IV. Other Recommendations

The program management review team has adopted further recommendations of the Value Engineering team regarding electrical wiring, electrical service, appropriate sizing of air conditioning units and storm drain piping.

aram pipmis.
\$ 272,650.00
\$ -0-
\$1,240,000.00*
\$ 251,000.00
\$ 151,000.00
\$ 416,000.00
\$ 193,920.00
\$2,524,570.00**

We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the Value Engineering report.

Sincerely,

Program Executive

Cc:

J. Scafuti R. Levis N. Hall R. Burton J. Shavin M. Russell

* Decision pending

^{**} Includes savings on roofing system, which is, as yet, undecided



Department: Human Services

VALUE ANALYSIS / ENGINEERING (VA/E) - JANUARY thru JUNE 2003

Telephone (305) 375-4448

Report Date: July 28, 2003

Department Contact: John Marshall				Fax: (305) 375-5290	375-5290					
ITEM NO. PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT JD	PROJECT BUDGET (8)	FUNDING SOURCE	VAJE COMPLETED? (Yes/No) if not, Win/? If not all recommended savings were approved suplain why and attach documentation as needed. Please indicate the name of the consultant performing the formal VAJE studies.	SAVINGS RECOMMENDED FROM YAZE STUDY(\$) \$ AMOUNT APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT	\$ AMOUNT REJECTED	% OF RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED	AMOUNT APPROVED AS % OF PROJECT BUDGET	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTED (S)	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS NOT IMPLEMENTED (\$)	IF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED, EXPLAIN
1 Victims Shelter	Total: \$2,591,011	Food & Beverage Tax	Please note that this project under the Department's direct							
	(Including Design		supervision, while over the \$1 million threshold was							
	Engineering 263,000)		determined by General Services Administration (GSA)							
			not suited/appropriate to conduct a Value Analysis							
			Engineering Study. The project is a remodeling and							
			expansion of an existing building.							
			* Engineering Company	;						
			J. Bontill & Associates, Inc.				_			
	İ	The state of the s	* Construction Firm:							
			Cuesta Construction Company							
тотаl	\$2,591,011		TOTAL							

		_	ITEM NO.	Depart	Depart	
TOTAL		New Juvenile Courthouse	PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT ID	Department Contact: Rick Martinez	Department: Judicial Administration	
\$105,000,000		\$105,000,000	PROJECT BUDGET		7	
		Special Obligation Bond issue	FÜNDING SOURCE			VALUE AI
TOTAL		Value Engineering not performed at this time. The project is currently in Special Obligation the programming phase. Architects and Contractors to be hired during the first six months in 2004. At that time Value Analysis/Engineering will be undertaken.	VALE COMPLETED? (YeaRNo) if not, Why? If not all recommended savings were approved explain why and attach documentaion as needed. Please indicate the name of the consultant performing the formal VALE studies SAVINGS RECOMMENDED FROM VALE STUDIES			VALUE ANALYSIS / ENGINEERING (VA/E) - JANUARY thru JUNE 2003
			\$ AMOUNT APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT	Fax: (305	Telephon	thru JUNE
			\$ AMOUNT REJECTED	Fax: (305) 349-7177	Telephone (305) 349-7425	2003
			% OF RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED	i	425	
			AMOUNT APPROVED AS % OF PROJECT BUDGET		Rep	
			AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTED (\$)		Report Date: July 2, 2003	
			AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS NOT IMPLEMENTED (\$)		ly 2, 2003	
			IF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED, EXPLAIN			1.0



		T		ТЕМ NO.	Dep	Dep	1
			1 Performing Arts Center Project No. 9501	A NO. PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT ID	Department Contact: Willie Pena	Department: Performing Arts Center	
TOTAL \$255,000,000.00				PROJECT BUDGET	ena	: Center	
0,000.00			\$255,000,000.00	r BUDGET			
			Convention Development Tax (CDT) & private funds from PAC Foundation	FUNDING SOURCE		100	VALUE AN
101			Convention No, process is still in progress. Identification of additional V/E will also be (CDT) & private funds of component of the construction process. Consultant performing VA/E: from PAC Foundation Cesar Pelii & Associates, Inc.	VAJE COMPLETED? (YasAo) If not, Why? If not all recommended savings were approved explain why and attach documentaion as needed. Please indicate the name of the consultant performing the formal VAJE studies.			VALUE ANALYSIS / ENGINEERING (VA/E) - JANUARY thru JUNE 2003
TOTAL \$12,848,422			7E: \$12,848,422	SAVINGS RECOMMENDED FROM VAZE STUDY(8)			NUARY thru
\$5,821,962			\$5,821,962	\$ AMOUNT APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT	Fax: (305) 372-7659	Telephone:	JUNE 200
\$7,026,460			\$7,026,460	\$ AMOUNT REJECTED	172-7659	Telephone: (305) 372-7611)3
			45%	% OF RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED		611	
			2%	AMOUNT APPROVED AS % OF PROJECT BUDGET		Z	
			\$498,345	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTED (\$)		Report Date: July 24, 2003	
			\$5,323,617	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS NOT IMPLEMENTED (\$)		July 24, 20	
			The V/E options will be will be implemented as construction proceeds.	IF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED, EXPLAIN		03	

Department: Park and Recreation

Telephone: (305) 755-5463

Report Date: August 26, 2003

13	12	=	10	9	88	7	6	UTI	4	3	22	-	ТЕМ NO.	Depart
Homeslead Air Reserve Park - Field Center, Picknic Shellers, 2 Soccer Fields, Parking Lot, and Walkways Project ID: No. 683601 02 001	Highland Oaks - Recreation Center, Parking, and Utilities Project ID: No. 123302 02 001	Haulover Marina Expansion-Phase 2, Project ID: P & R No. 00015 (A. V.)	Goulds-Wings Phase 2 & Field Lighting Project ID: No. 601805 02 003	Greynolds Boathouse & Ada Upgrades Project ID: No. 22090102093	Crandon Park Clubhouse - Project ID: old No. 71039 NEW-4228010 10 022	Crandon Park - Central Restrooms, Dockmaster Facilities, and ADA Upgrades Project ID: No. 422801 02 010	Country Club of Miami - Stormwater Miligation and Irrigation - Project ID: old No. 99054 NEW-200203 99 001	Chuck Pezolldt Park - Project ID: No. 592801 02 001	Carol City Community Center - Recreation & Community Center - Project ID: old No. 98010 NEW-210404 98 001	Amelia Earhart Phase 2 - Field House, Lighted Parking Lot, 2 Softball Fields Project ID: old No. 98002 NEW 311509 98 001	Amelia Earhart Phase 1 - Four Lighted Soccer Fields, Parking Lot, and Field Center	African Herritage Cultural Center and Music Hall - Project ID: old No. 98002 NEW 311509 98 001	PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT ID	Department Contact: Anselmo Silvio Montero / Jorge Mora
\$2,400,000	\$1,165,381	\$3,517,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	\$5,500,000	\$3,190,265	\$6,154,948	\$2,535,477	\$9,100,000	\$3,590,689	\$3,330,971	\$1,290,000	PROJECT BUDGET	tero / Jorge Mi
SNPB	SNPB, IMPACT FEES	SNPB	QNIP	SNP	BOS	SNPB, MOU, FIND	CORF	IMPACT FEES	SNPB, CORF	QNIP	SNPB	SNPB, PACT, FDSCFG	FUNDING SOURCE	ora
No- Protatype Building: VA/E not needed.	No- Prototype Building; VA/E not needed.	No/Pending - On hold until seagrass issue is resolved	Yes - Completed. Consultant performing the formal VA/E study Architects International	No/pending - Design program recently completed.	Yes - Completed. Consultant performing the formal VA/E study Architects International	No- 3 Small Bidgs. approx. 900 Sq Ft average size, located at 3 different sites. Currently in 100% Construction Documents.	No - Stormwater portion of project was designed by another Department and the Irrigation portion is a Design-Build by the Contractor.	No- Prototype Building; VA/E not needed.	No/ Pending Project is currently in Programming and Schematic Phase.	No- Prototype Building, VA/E not needed.	No- Prototype Building; VA/E not needed.	No - CM@RIsk Project - No VA/E in the traditional sense, Department of Arts & Culture performed value engineering review as well as the CM prior to Owner accepting GMP.	VAE COMPLETED? (Yearho) if not, Why? If not all recommended savings were approved explain why and affect documentation as needed, please indicate the name of the consultant performing the formal VAE studies.	
N/A	N/A	ТВО	\$56,173	N/A	\$168,402	N/A	N/A	N/A	ТВО	N/A	N/A	N/A	SAVINGS RECOMMENDED FROM VAIE STUDY(S)	
N/A	N/A	TBD	\$2,777	N/A	\$28,219	N/A	Ν/A	N/A	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A	S AMOUNT APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT	Fax: (305) 75
A/N	N/A	TBD	\$53,396	N/A	\$140,183	N/A	N/A	N/A	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A	S AMOUNT REJECTED	55-7995
N/A	N/A	ТВО	0.05%	N/A	17%	N/A	N/A	N/A	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A	% OF RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED	
N/A	N/A	TBD	0.002%	N/A	0.01%	N/A	N/A	N/A	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A	AMOUNT APPROVED AS % OF PROJECT BUDGET	
N/A	N/A	TBD	\$2,777	N/A	\$28,219	N/A	N/A	N/A	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS MPLEMENTED (\$)	
N/A	N/A	TBD	\$53,396	N/A	\$140,183	N/A	AIN	N/A	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS NOT IMPLEMENTED (\$)	
N/A	N/A	T8D	VAIE recommendation was to reduce kitchen to snack bar, and lower the addition's roof. Operations need for a full kitchen in lieu of the suggested snack bar area and the need to match the existing gymnasium wi metal roofs and higher volumes ted to the rejection of some other value engineering recommendations.	N/A	Major VA/E recommendation to do away with basement which was part of the Master Plan as well as an operational requirement was not implemented.	N/A	N/A	N/A	ТВО	N/A	N/A	N/A	IF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED, EXPLAIN	

D

Department: Park and Recreation

Telephone: (305) 755-5463

Report Date: August 26, 2003

	27	26	25	24	23	22	21	20	15	18	17	16	15	14	ITEM NO.
TOTAL	Deerwood Park - Med-All Rec Center, Lighted Parking Lot. Project ID: P&R No.59240103003	Wild Lime Park- Field Center,Lighted Parking Lot and Soccer Fields. Project ID: P&R No. 590903 02 001	Westwind Lakes - Large Recreational Center and Lighted Parking Lot. Project ID: P&R No. 492801 01 001	West Perrine Park, Med. Alt. Rec. Ctr. Project ID: P&R No. 503204 02 001	Southridge Park - Field House, Lighting, Bleachers, Pads, Fencing, Walways, Parking, and Water Main Extension. Project ID: old No. 97020 NEW-600603	North Trail Park - Medium Size Recreation Building and Resteaom Facilities. Project ID: P & R No. 395201 02 003	Miami West - Field Center, Soifball Fields, and Parking Lot Project ID: P & R No. <u>WA</u>	Miami Carol City - Medium Alternate Recreation Center & Walkway Lights Project ID: P & R No.210403 01 001	Martin Luiher King Jr. Park Project ID: P & R No. 311608 02 002	Lakes By the Bay Park Project ID: P&R No.	Kendall Soccer Park Phase 2- Parking, Walkways, and Soccer Field 99155Project ID: old No. 002005 NEW-493501 00 001	Kendall Soccer Park Phase 1 Field Center, Soccer Field, Parking Lot, and Irrigation Project ID: old No. 99155 NEW-493501 99 001	Kendall Indian Hammocks Park- Field Genter, Storage Building and Park Improvements. Project ID: No. 403101 02 002	Ives Estates District Park New Development, Field Center, 2 Lighter Football/Soccer Field, Pionic Area and Parking Lot. Project ID: No. 128203 02 001	IO. PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT ID
\$70,451,477	\$1,400,000	\$1,801,717	\$1,504,538	\$2,479,000	\$1,314,101	\$1,284,864	\$1.500,000	\$1,123,000	\$1,100,000	\$4,000,000	\$2,437,784	\$1,900,000	\$1,631,742	\$2,400,000	PROJECT BUDGET
	QNIP	IMPACT FEES, CBO GRANT,QNIP	PARK IMPACT FEES	SNP, QNIP, IMPACT FEES	SNPB, HG, IMPACT FEES, CDGG	CORF, QNIP	SNPB,IMPACTFE E	CDBG, QNIP	SNP, QNIP,GRANT	QNIP, IMPACT FEES	QNIP, WASAD	QNIP, IMPACT FEES WASAD	SNPB, QNIP, CORF	IMPACT FEES	FUNDING SOURCE
TOTAL	No- Prototype Building: VAVE not needed.	No- Prototype Building; VA/E not needed.	No- Prototype Building; VAVE not needed.	No-Prototype Building: VA/E not needed.	No-Prototype Building; VA/E not needed.	No- Prototype Building; VAVE not needed.	No- Prototype Building: VA/E not needed.	No- Prototype Building; VA/E not needed.	No- Prototype Building: VA/E not needed.	No/Pending - Project is on HOLD.	No- Prototype Building; VWE not needed.	No- Prototype Building; VME not needed.	No- Protatype Building: VA/E not needed.	IMPACT FEES No- Prototype Building: VA/E not needed.	VAE COMPLETED? (Yearho) if not, Why? If notall recommended savings were approved explain why and attach occurrentaion as needed. Please indicate the name of the consultant performing the formal VAE studies.
\$224,575	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NIA	N/A	N/A	SAVINGS RECOMMENDED FROM VAJE STUDY(S)
\$30,996	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	S AMOUNT APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT
\$193,579	N/A	N/A	N/A	NIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	NIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$AMOUNT REJECTED
<u></u>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	AIN	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	% OF RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	AMOUNT APPROVED AS % OF Project Budget
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	AIN	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	AMOUNT OF: RECOMMENDATIONS (IMPLEMENTED (S)
	N/A	N/A	N/A	NIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	NIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS NOT IMPLEMENTED (S)
	N/A	N/A	N/A	NIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/Α	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	A/N	IF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED, EXPLAIN

11

	A 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
	A CONTRACTOR
	TEC.
	10.00
	100
8	
١	P000(CC) 15 80 . XXXXXXX . XXXXXX

Department: Public Works

Department Contact: Gaspar Miranda

Telephone (305) 375-2094

Report Date: August 19, 2003

	23	21	20	19	1 8	17	16	15	14	ಪ	12	===	10	9	8	5	Сп	4	ယ	2	_	ITEM NO.	Depa
TOTAL	SW 104 St. from 147th Ave. to 137 Ave.	NW 17 Ave. from 19 St. to Opa Locka Blvd.	NE 12 Ave. from NE 151 St. to NE 167 St.	Grand Ave.from SW 37 Ave. to SW 32 Ave.	To NE	NW 72 Ave. from NW 74 St. to Okeechobee Rd.	9. 10 F	NE 15 Ave. from NE 159 to 186 St.	Dade Blvd./23rd St.Bridge Replacement	SW 328 St. from SW 162 to 152 Ave.	NW 58 St. from NW 107 to 102 Ave.	SW 184 St. from SW 137 to 127 Ave.	SW 184 St. from SW 147 to 137 Ave.	NW 62 St. from NW 47 to 37 Ave.	Barbara Goleman Connector Rd. from NW 89 to 87 Ave.	NW 17 Ave. Bridge over Miami River (Phase I - Refurbishing)	SW 117 Ave.from SW 184 to 152 St.	W 24 Ave. from W 52 to 76 St.	NW 62 Ave. from NW 105 to 138 St.	SW 137 Ave.from SW 56 to 88 St.	NW 97 Ave. Bridge over SR 836	PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT ID	Department Contact: Gaspar Miranda
\$67,850,000	\$3,500,000	\$3,000,000	\$2,400,000	\$2,500,000	\$3,200,000	\$3,100,000	\$1,100,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,100,000	\$2,800,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,400,000	\$2,600,000	\$3,700,000	\$1,300,000	\$2,200,000	\$4,900,000	\$4,000,000	\$3,100,000	\$2,500,000	\$12,650,000	PROJECT BUDGET	
	Road Impact Fee District 4	Road Impact Fee District 3	Road Impact Fee District 3	RIF 2/City of Miami	RIF 2/Village Miami Shores	Road Impact Fee District 1	Road Impact Fee District 6	Road Impact Fee District 3	Road Impact Fee District 8	Road Impact Fee District 6	Road Impact Fee District 1	Road Impact Fee District 5	Road Impact Fee District 5	Secondary Gas Tax	Road Impact Fee District 3	Secondary Gas Tax	Road Impact Fee District 5	Secondary Gas Tax	Secondary Gas Tax	Road Impact Fee District 5	Road Impact Fee District 1	FUNDING SOURCE	
	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No ⋅ see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	No - see attached memorandum	YES/ Wollberg Alvarez and Partners/ Most comments were declined due to conflict with future widening of SR-836 by Miami-Dade Expressway Authority (MDX)	VAJE COMPLETED? (Yes/No) if not, Why? If not all recommended springs were approved axplain why and affect documentation as resided. Please indicate the name of the consultant performing the formal VAJE studies.	
\$573,284	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$573,284	SAVINGS RECOMMENDED FROM VAIE STUDY(\$)	
\$57,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NJA	N/A	N/A	N/A	NIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$57,000	\$ AMOUNT APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT	Fax:
\$516,284	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$516,284	\$ AMOUNT REJECTED.	
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9.90%	% OF RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED	ı
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.57%	AMOUNT APPROVED AS % OF PROJECT BUDGET	
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$57,000	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTED (\$)	
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NIA	N/A	N/A	\$516,284	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS NOT IMPLEMENTED (\$)	
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	See "E" column for explanation	IF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED, EXPLAIN	



MEMORANDUM

TO:

Aristides Rivera, P.E., P.L.S

Acting Director

DATE: December 2, 1999

FROM: Esther

Assistant Director.

Highway Engineering & Traffic

SUBJECT: Value Engineering Analysis

Value Engineering Analysis is a formal review of a construction project including a life cycle analysis for the purpose of reducing capital costs and maintenance and operating costs over the life of the facility. To provide a proper Value Engineering (V/E) Analysis, specialized experience is required in design, construction, engineering specifications, and economic analysis. If this procedure is to be implemented, please note that additional staff and training will definitely be required. Currently, the Highway Division has more that 150 roadway and public works projects listed in various development stages. Of all those projects, only two have construction costs of \$5,000,000 or more. Therefore, because of the small scale of almost all Public Works projects, the additional cost, effort, and time delay to provide a value engineering analysis and quarterly reporting for projects over \$1,000,000 will outweigh any savings realized from the value analysis.

Traditionally, construction plans for roadway projects have included design reviews at 30%, 50%, and 90% completion. The reviews by the Plans Review & Design project managers include quality control, compliance with design criteria, and design economics. Most roadway projects include generally the same elements (roadway, curb & gutters, continuous drainage, sidewalks, signing & pavement markings, signalization, etc.), and the design criteria has evolved to include the most economical solutions. However, the project manager routinely provides a level of value analysis through the normal review process.

The duties of project managers in developing projects for bidding have become more complex in the last three years with added requirements including public meetings, reviews by the MPO. reviews with the bicycle coordinator, additional early reviews by DERM, reviews by the Department of Planning, Development & Regulation, additional utility reviews, ADA reviews, and others. Additionally, the development of the master plan for each project previously done by the Planning Section is now the responsibility of the Plans Review project manager. In addition, there is also increased involvement by commissioners and municipalities, resulting in more design modifications and the re-scheduling of projects. All of this has increased the project manager's man-hour requirements for developing project designs, adding to the time it takes to develop contract plans for bidding. Therefore, providing yet another requirement of value analysis reporting, will increase the delay of project bid letting and will add to the duties already overburdening our project managers.

Based on these facts, it is requested that Value Engineering Analysis and quarterly reporting on value engineering activities be limited to the large scale projects of \$5,000,000 or more, where savings can be identified that will clearly outweigh the cost, delays, and the efforts that will be required.



Department: Seaport

Department Contact: Gyselle Fernandez

Telephone: (305) 347-4833

Report Date: August 25, 2003

	2	
	82	33
	×	8
×	ė	ö
¥	¢	ij
×	¢	į
ä	ŝ	į
Ä	í	į
	í	Š
	í	e S
	í	
	į	
	1	
	1	
	10.	
	10.	
	100	
	100	
	100.	
	1000	
	1000	
	1000	
	1000	
	1000	

		14	13	ฆ์	1	10	ص	8	7	6	51	4	3	2	_]	ITEM NO.
TOTAL		33 -Security Improvements, Inc. Fiber Grid	32.1 - Mooring Improvements Phase 1	30 - Wharf 6	29 - Comfort Stations	26 -New Port Maintenance Facility	24 - New Terminal Equipment Maintenance Facility	23 - New Refrigerated Yard, Relocation of Chiquita	18 - Western Roadway, Flyover & Port Signage	17 - Cargo Gate Facility	16 - Eastern Port Boulevard	15 - Sitework and Landscaping	13 - Parking Control Systems	12.2 - Command Center	4 - Cruise Loop Road	NO. PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT ID
\$78,602,745		\$7,854,000	\$2,995,000	\$18,171,000	\$2,316,000	\$4,018,635	\$2,995,000	\$1,461,000	\$13,986,453	\$8,781,465	\$2,316,000	\$2,583,000	\$1,700,000	\$4,393,000	\$5,032,192	PROJECT BUDGET
		TSA & FSTED Grant & Loan	2001 Sunshine State Loan	2001 Sunshine State Loan	ē	do .	2001 Sunshine State Loan	2001 Sunshine State Loan	FSTED Grant & 2001 Loan	ρο	- 2∞	2001 Sunshine State Loan	2001 Sunshine State Loan	TOPS Grant & 2001 Loan	FSTED Grant & 2001 Loan	FUNDING SOURCE
TOTAL		Yes. Seasecure, LLC. Design Build.	Yes. Hans-Padron Associates. Design Build.	Yes. Meisner Marine Construction, Inc. Design Build.	No. Design ongoing	No. Design ongoing	Project on Hold	Yes. DMJM+HARRIS, Inc. Design Build.	No, Design Ongoing	No. Design ongoing	No. Design ongoing	No. Design ongoing	No. Design ongoing	No. Design ongoing	No. Design ongoing	VAE COMPLETED? (Yes/No) if not, Why? If not all recommended savings were approved explain why and affach documentation as needed. Please indicate the name of the consultant performing the formal VAE studies.
\$7,775,864		\$461,510	\$2,228,200	\$4,086,154				\$1,000,000								SAVINGS RECOMMENDED FROM VA/E STUDY(\$)
\$7,775,864		 \$461,510	\$2,228,200	\$4,086,154				\$1,000,000								\$ AMOUNT APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT
\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0				\$0								\$ AMOUNT REJECTED
		100%	100%	100%				100%								% OF RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED
		6%	74%	22%				68%			-					AMOUNT APPROVED AS % OF PROJECT BUDGET
		\$461,510	\$2,228,200	\$4,086,154				\$1,000,000								AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTED (\$)
		\$0	\$6	\$0				\$6								AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS NOT IMPLEMENTED (\$)
																IF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED, EXPLAIN

				ITEM NO.	Departm	Departm	25.45
TOTAL			Resources Recovery Cell 19	PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT ID	Department Contact: EDUARDO RUBIO-GARCIA	Department: DEPARTMENT OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT	
\$3,500,000			\$3,500,000	PROJECT BUDGET (8)		NAGEMENT	
			SWEDORRAC190	FUNDING SOURCE			VALUE ANAL
ΤΟΤΑΙ			Design/Permitting - 100% Complete. Construction Design and Construction on "HOLD". V/A ongoing	VALE COMPLETED? (Yes/No) If not, Why? If not all recommended savings were approved explain why and effect decumentation as needed. Please indicate the name of the consultant performing the formal VAPE studies.			VALUE ANALYSIS ENGINEERING (VA/E) - JANUARY th
			N/A	SAVINGS RECOMMENDED FROM VA/E STUDY(\$)			thru ال
			N/A	\$ AMOUNT APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT	Fax: (305) 594-1673	Telephone	ru JUNE 2003
			N/A	\$ AMOUNT REJECTED	594-1673	[elephone: (305) 594-1525	192100 1931
			N/A	% OF RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED		1525	
			N/A	AMOUNT APPROVED AS % OF PROJECT BUDGET			
			N/A	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTED (\$)		Report Date: July 23, 2003	
			N/A	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS NOT IMPLEMENTED (\$)		: July 23, 2	
	-		N/A	IF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED, EXPLAIN		:003	1943 1943





Department: Water and Sewer

Department Contact: Alma M. Santiago, P.E.

Telephone: (786) 552-8150

Report Date: August 14, 2003

Fax: (786) 552-8642

								= 1
-	7	6	СЛ	4	ω	N		ITEM NO.
TOTAL	Contract W-813, Miami Springs Sludge Lagoon Partition Dyke	Contract W-854, South Miami Heights WTP Perimeter Wall and Landscaping	Contract W-847, ASR Ultraviolet Disinfection System at the West and Southwest Wellfields	Contract W-845, Installation of 16" WM in NE 215 St. and NE 213 St. from Highland Lakes Blvd. to NE 28 Ave.	Contract S-776, Mechanical Integrity Testing of Deep Injection Wells and Associated Services at Various Sites	Contract S-739B Revised, Installation of 36" FM at SW 157 Ave. from SW 152 St. to SW 136 St.	Contract S-737, Installation of 24" FM at SW 184 St. From E. of 137 Ave. to E. of SW 127 Ave., From E. of SW 127 Ave., Form E. of SW 127 Ave. to SW 185 Terr. And SW 185 Ave., and 24", 16", 12" and 8" WM in SW 184 St. from SW 137 to SW 127 Ave.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT ID.
\$16,693,000	\$2,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,020,000	\$1,062,000	\$3,565,000	\$1,230,000	\$3,316,000	PROJECT BUDGET
-	FN 60	FN 66	FN 60	FN 36	FN 47	FN 47	FN 47 & 36	FUNDING SOURCE
TOTAL	Yes, Informal	Yes, Informal	Yes, Informal	Yes, Informal	Yes, Informal	Yes, Informal	Yes, Informal	VAE COMPLETED? (YesANo) it not, Why? If not all recommended savings were approved explain why and attach documentation as needed. Please indicate the hame of the consultant performing the formal VA/E studies
	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	SAVINGS RECOMMENDED FROM VA/E STUDY(\$)
	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ AMOUNT APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT
	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ AMOUNT REJECTED
	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	% OF RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED
	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	AMOUNT APPROVED AS % OF PROJECT BUDGET
	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTED (\$)
	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS NOT IMPLEMENTED (\$)
	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	IF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED, EXPLAIN

Eunding Source

FN 36 - Water Renewal & Replacement Fund FN 47 - Plant Expansion - Water FN 60 - Water Revenue Bond - Series 1995

VA/E Semi-Annual Report January thru June, 2003 Page 15 of 17



Departments Reporting No VA/E Analysis during this period

Department

Audit & Management Services Aviation

Building Department

Building Code Compliance

Community Action Agency

Cultural Affairs

Consumer Services Department

Elections

Employee Relations Department Independent Review Panel

Juvenile Assessment Center

Miami-Dade Fire Rescue Department Miami-Dade Police Department

Office of Public Transportation Management

Office of Safe Neighborhood Parks

Daniel Capotorto Andrea Braynon Sheila Rushton Ana Rodriguez Marie Dennis Peter Velar

David Clodfelter

Reported By

Ronald Williamson

John Clouser

Dr. Eduardo I. Diaz

Susan Windmiller

Gianni Lehmann

Ahmed Rasheed Frank Vecin

Beverly Mirman

VA/E Semi-Annual Report January Thru June 2003 Page 16 of 17



***					Ŀ	The second second	COLUMN STREET,	-			2000		
						\$10,239,753	\$16,210,392	TOTAL \$26,450,145	тота	ŏ	\$375,031,000	TOTAL	-
	VAE recommendation was to reduce kilchen to snack bar, and lower the addition's roof. Operations need for a full kitchen in lieu of the suggested snack bar area and the need to match the existing gyrmnasium w/ metal roofs and higher volumes led to the rejection of some other value engineering recommendations.	\$53,396	\$2,777	0.002%	0.05%	\$53,396	\$2,777	\$56,173	Yes - Completed. Consultant performing the formal VA/E study Architects International	QNIP	\$1,400,000	Goulds-Wings Phase 2 & Field Lighting Project ID: No. 601805 02 003	
		\$0	\$1,000,000	68%	100%	\$5	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	Yes. DMJM+HARRIS, Inc. Design Build.	2001 Sunshine State Loan	\$1,461,000	23 - New Refrigerated Yard, Relocation of Chiquita	
		\$6	\$2,228,200	74%	100%	\$0	\$2,228,200	\$2,228,200	Yes. Hans-Padron, Associates. Design Build	2001 Sunshine State Loan	\$2,995,000	32.1 - Mooring Improvements Phase 1	
		\$0	\$461,510	6%	100%	\$0	\$461,510	\$461,510	Yes, Seaseoure, LLC, Design Build.	TSA & FSTED Grant & Loan	\$7,854,000	33 - Security Improvements, Inc. Fiber Grid	
18	Major VAE recommendation to do away with basement which was part of the Master Plan as well as an operational requirement was not implemented.	\$140,183	\$28,219	0.01%	17%	\$140,183	\$28,219	\$168,402	Yes - Completed, Consultant performing the formal VAE study, - Architects international	SOB	\$5,500,000	Crandon Park Clubhouse - Project ID: old No. 71039 NEW-4228010 10 022	
)		\$	\$4,086,154	22%	100%	8	\$4,086,154	\$4,086,154	Yes. Design Build. Meisner Marine Construction, Inc.	2001 Sunshine State Loan	\$18,171,000	30 - Wharl 6	
		\$516,284	\$57,000	0.57%	9,90%	\$516,284	\$57,000	\$573,284	Fee Yes/ Wolfberg Alvarez and Partners/ Most comments were declined due to conflict with future widening of SR-835 by Mami-Dade Expressively Authority (MDX)	Road Impact Fee District 1	\$12,650,000	NW 97 Ave. Bridge over SR 836	
	Construction not yet begun, Recommendations have not been implemented.			3.61%	50.21%	\$2,503,430	\$2,524,570	\$5,028,000	WE has been completed. It was performed by the Consulting Firm of Alien HOPE VI Grant Consulting, Inc. in conjunction with EAC Correlating, Inc. A copy of their final Surax Fund and Ireport is attached. Not all recommendations will be incorporated. Please other sources (See Irelet to attached letter from H.J. Russell & Company Dated May 5, 2003, Attachment). Which details what recommendations will be incorporated and the rationale behind the decisions.	HOPE VI Grant Surtax Fund and other sources (See Attachment)	\$70,000,000	HOPE VI - Rehabiliation Program Scott Homes FLA 5-004 Carver Homes FLA 5-020	
	The V/E options will be implemented as construction proceeds.	\$5,323,617	\$498,345	2%	45%	\$7,026,460	\$5,821,962	\$12,848,422	Tax No, process is still in progress. Identification of additional VIE will also be a rake component of the construction process. Consultant performing VAE: Cesar AC Pell & Associates, Inc.	Convention Development Tax (CDT) & private funds from PAC Foundation	\$255,000,000.00	Performing Arts Center Project No. 9501	
	IF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED, EXPLAIN	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS NOT IMPLEMENTED (S)	AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTED (\$)	AMOUNT APPROVED AS % OF PROJECT BUDGET	% OF RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED	\$ AMOUNT REJECTED	S AMOUNT APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT	SAVINGS RECOMMENDED FROM VAJE STUDY(s)	VAJE COMPLETEDT (Yeshko) I not. Why? If not ill recommended sakings eare approved explain why not altact decrimentation as medial. Please rapidoes this plane of the consultant partitioning the formal VAJE studies.	ET FUNDING SOURCE	PROJECT BUDGET	PROJECT DESCRIPTION PROJECT ID	
	A CONTRACT OF THE PROPERTY OF				g Reports	llysis Engineerin	Totals of all required formal Value Analysis Engineering Reports	of all required I	Total				

Carol City Community Center - Recreation & Community Center - Project ID: old No. 98010 NEW-210404 98 001

\$9,100,000

SNPB, CORF No/ Pending Project is currently in Programming and Schematic Phase.

4 - Cruise Loop Road 17 - Cargo Gate Facility

\$5,032,192

FSTED Grant & No. Design ongoing 2001 Loan FSTED Grant & No. Design ongoing 2001 Loan

\$8,781,465

18 - Western Roadway, Flyover & Port Signage

\$13,986,453

FSTED Grant & No, Design Ongoing 2001 Loan

New Juvenile Courthouse

\$105,000,000

Special Obligation Value Engineering not performed at this time. The project is currently in the programming phase. Architects and Contractors to be hired during the first six months in 2004. At that time Value Analysis/Engineering will be undertaken.

FORMAL VA/E STUDIES PENDING